# MEETING STATE OF CALIFORNIA LANDS COMMISSION

TSAKOPOULOS LIBRARY GALLERY

EAST MEETING ROOM

821 I STREET

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2011 1:32 P.M.

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR, RPR CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER LICENSE NUMBER 10063

# APPEARANCES

# BOARD MEMBERS

- Mr. Gavin Newsom, Lieutenant Governor, Chairperson
- Mr. John Chiang, State Controller, also represented by Ms. Cindy Aronberg
- Ms. Ana J. Matosantos, Director of Finance, represented by Mr. Fred Klass

# STAFF

- Mr. Curtis Fossum, Executive Officer
- Ms. Jennifer Lucchesi, Chief Counsel
- Mr. David Brown, Chief, Administrative Services Division
- Mr. Brian Bugsch, Chief, Land Management Division
- Mr. Mario De Bernardo, Legislative Liaison
- Mr. Martin Eskijian, Chief Engineer
- Ms. Maurya Falkner, Environmental Program Manager I
- Mr. Kevin Mercier, Acting Chief, Marine Facilities Division
- Mr. Cy Oggins, Chief, Environmental Planning Division
- Mr. Gregory Scott, Chief, Mineral Resources Division

## ALSO PRESENT

Ms. Jan Brisco, Tahoe Lakefront Owners Association

INDEX			D 7 G E
			<u>PAGE</u>
I	OPEN	1 SESSION	1
II	А.	AMENDMENT TO MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF OCTOBER 29, 2010 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF	2
		December 10, 2010	3
III	EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT		3
IV	CONSENT CALENDAR C01 - C37		9
V.	REGULAR CALENDAR 38 - 39		
	38	CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION (PARTY): Consider sponsoring legislation regarding administrative action against unauthorized structures, vessels, and buoys; marine invasive species; lease quitclaims; recreational piers; and trust lands in Chula Vista; and supporting legislation regarding sea level rise planning and the Commission's oil spill prevention program.	12
	39	IA Sacramento Holdings, L.L.C., City of Sacramento, California Department of Parks and Recreation, STATE LANDS COMMISSION (PARTIES): ITEM HAS BEEN POSTPONED TO A FUTURE MEETING	9
Report on the Activities of the Commission			5 2
VI PUBLIC COMMENT			103
Adjournment			104
Reporter's Certificate			105

## PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: I'll call the formalized meeting of the State Lands Commission to order.

A few of the representatives of the Commission are here, and I'm grateful you took time to be here. And introduce yourselves so everyone knows who you are.

ACTING COMMISSIONER ARONBERG: Cindy Aronberg, a Deputy for State Controller, John Chiang. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Great.

And I am -- as is the case, Lieutenant Governor rotates into the position of Chair as the State Lands Commission Chair. And so I'm honored to be here. And we'll expect the Controller shortly.

And for those that are completely unfamiliar with the proceedings of the State Lands Commission, we administer certain property interest owned by the State, including mineral interests. It's interesting, that's what they told me to say.

(Laughter.)

2.4

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: The mineral interests lobby is clearly alive and well.

And today we'll hear proposals concerning the leasing and management of these public property interests.

The first item on the agenda today is the adoption of the amended minutes from the Commission's

1 October meeting.

And, Mr. Fossum, you've got I think those amendments in your presence.

And we're joined by our Controller, John Chiang. EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: Yes, thank you, Mr.

Chair.

2.4

Good afternoon, Commissioners, and welcome Chairman Newsom and welcome back Commissioner Chiang.

The first item is an amendment to the Commission's minutes from the October meeting. At that meeting, the Commission adopted Item 64 submitted by the staff. However, during the oral presentation of that item, there was a modification made by the staff from a 60-day provision for execution of a lease to six months. That was not picked up in the minutes when they were approved in December, so they are being amended at this time for -- or being provided to you for your consideration at this time.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Any discussion about that amendment?

May I have a motion to approve the minutes amended?

COMMISSIONER CHIANG: So moved.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: And seconded?

I guess I'll second.

1 Unanimous.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: We'll move the amended item

4 on.

And the second item for business, the adoption of minutes of the December meeting.

Any discussion?

COMMISSIONER CHIANG: Move approval.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Moved and seconded.

And the minutes are moved forward unanimously.

And the next order of business, Executive Director's report.

Mr. Executive Director.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: Thank you. I have a number of items to report to you today.

As a cleanup matter from the last meeting, I should report for the record that in the closed session of the Commission on December 10th, the Commissioners did appoint me as the Executive Officer by a three to zero vote.

On today's calendar we have a rather short agenda, with only 38 items and only one that's not on the consent calendar. Typically, the agenda would have 50 or more items with as many as eight being discussed and not being on a consent. For example, last June we had 93

agenda items.

And because we only have one regular item on the agenda today, we're going to take the opportunity to provide the Commission and the public with some information on activities the Commission staff is involved with.

I've asked the chiefs of each of the divisions -Commission's six divisions to present a short
informational PowerPoint presentation following the
regular agenda. This should only take about 45 minutes.

Secondly, I'm pleased to announce today that your staff is meeting with contractors in Santa Barbara to implement the Commission's Santa Barbara Channel Hazard Removal Program. The program's objective is to eliminate risk to public health and safety along the beach in Santa Barbara and Ventura counties. The program was first approved by the Commission on October 1st, 2002. However, before all the permits and contracts could be let, the \$600,000 the Legislature had budgeted for removal of those hazards was swept back into the general fund due to a, then existing, State fiscal crisis.

After receiving \$700,000 from the federal government, we are now proceeding with removal of 19 hazards. Staff was able to remove three of the initial 22 hazards identified by our investigation with the

assistance of adjacent property owners.

Those sites include 120 metal H piles, two steel groins, and approximately 500 railroad metal rails on the beach. Many of these hazards are from early oil exploration in the 1920s and 30s.

I also would like to report that the audit of the Commission by the Bureau of State Audits, that was in response to former Senator Cogdill's request last summer, is proceeding. Bureau staff came to the Commission in November. And since then, our staff has been cooperating with the audit staff to answer questions they have and provide them with all the information they're seeking.

The process has been a positive one in that their inquiries have already raised a number of issues that have allowed our staff to reassess certain practices to improve the timeliness of reviewing our leases.

We anticipate that the final report will ultimately provide additional recommendations that will help enable the Commission to keep up with the ongoing workload involving the thousands of leases the Commission's approved and administers.

On oil spill prevention. Following the Commission's action in December, staff has sent notices to the oil companies operating on State-submerged lands informing them of interim guidelines for having

third-party certification of blowout preventers as part of their well drilling operations. Staff will be returning to the Commission later this year with proposed regulations for formally implementing third-party certification. Your staff is meeting today in Ventura with a private company involved in third-party certification for federal offshore leases to discuss the Commission's program.

Item 38 today will be discussing the revenue shortfall facing our oil spill prevention fund. We are also attempting to resolve the serious issue of staff shortages in the Oil Spill Prevention Program.

On a final and sad note, it's with deep regret that I have to announce to you that our Legislative Liaison and Staff Counsel, Mario De Bernardo, will be moving on to a new job on Monday as a senior consultant with the Assembly Natural Resources Committee. With all the limitations on hiring and promotions, we were not able to compete with the Legislature. Our loss will be their gain.

When I first met Mario nearly three and a half years ago, I thought there was something special about him. Only later did I realize the reality of that first impression. Before interviewing for a job with the Commission, Mario had the foresight to go to the Capitol

and watch the Commission in action.

Mario's resumé was also impressive, a BA in Political Science from Berkeley where he served as Attorney General of the State Student Body. He followed that up with work for a law firm for nearly two years prior to entering law school.

During law school, Mario worked with the San Mateo District Attorney's Office and clerked with the Office of Administrative Hearings. He also did an internship with Congressman Sam Farr in Washington during his college years.

While working with the Commission, Mario has accomplished things, not the least of which were getting married to Jenny and becoming a father to Lulu.

All those who had the privilege of working with Mario know of his ability to grasp many complicated issues and thoroughly understand and explain them to diverse audiences. As an attorney, Mario has brought the Commission an added bonus of both understanding the law as well as the process in creating it. Mario is genial, quick witted, and hard working.

One of my fondest memories of Mario took place at his first Commission meeting as Legislative Liaison. The Commission Chair asked Executive Officer Paul Thayer to provide the Commissioners with some information. The

```
1
    issue involved legislation. And Mario jumped from his
    chair, nearly pushing Paul aside, responding, "I got
 2
    it" --
 3
             (Laughter.)
 4
             EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: -- as he rushed to the
5
6
    microphone. That exemplifies Mario's initiative,
7
    confidence, and dedication. Mario, you got it.
8
             (Laughter.)
9
             EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: Thanks for being you.
10
   You'll be missed.
11
             That concludes my report until the division
12
    chiefs' PowerPoint presentation after the regular
13
    calendar.
14
             Thank you.
15
             CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: All right.
16
             COMMISSIONER CHIANG: Mr. Chairman?
17
             First, Curtis, I just wanted to say thank you for
18
    staying on. I'm very pleased to have you at the helm.
19
    And you will continue to do excellent work.
20
             And then, Mario, I just wanted to highlight my
21
    thanks to your incredible dedication and service. You are
22
    truly a star. We actually had bigger plans for you here.
23
    So we hope your State Lands Commission service has not
24
    ended, at least from my personal perspective.
```

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: Thank you.

25

9

```
1
             COMMISSIONER CHIANG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
 2
             CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: You want to make public what
3
   your plans were? Maybe Mario --
 4
             (Laughter.)
5
             CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: -- will change his mind.
 6
             (Laughter.)
7
             COMMISSIONER CHIANG: Curtis isn't so young.
8
             (Laughter.)
9
             EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: I'll stipulate to
10
    that.
11
             (Laughter.)
             CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Very good. Thank you.
12
13
             And the next order of business, the adoption of
14
    the consent calendar.
15
             Are there any items that are being pulled from
16
    the consent calendar?
17
             EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: Yes, Mr. Chair.
18
    39, dealing with the Sacramento rail yards, will be pulled
19
    from this agenda and hopefully come on an agenda in the
20
   not too distant future.
21
             CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Okay.
                                          Great.
22
             COMMISSIONER CHIANG: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to
23
   pull C12, please.
2.4
             CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: C12.
             All right. Just in terms of C12, you want any
25
```

discussion on that, or we're just pulling that for the next -- for another time?

COMMISSIONER CHIANG: Do we -- can we discuss that later today when it comes up since it's been pulled, or does it have to be scheduled for the next meeting?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: As long as you're not making any decisions on it once it's pulled, you can discuss it at your pleasure.

COMMISSIONER CHIANG: Sure. I think this is an important issue. We need to get a handle on the finances of those who have our tidelands money -- or trust money, to make sure that it is being spent as designed. My concern is the fact that we don't have sufficient resources with this agency to do a robust review of those public dollars.

For instance, the Harbor Department in Redondo
Beach - and I'm not singling out Redondo Beach, but
obviously they have been reviewed previously - there were
a few years ago \$15 million in reserves. I'm not sure
where that is today and I'm not sure if any of it is
within our jurisdiction.

I want to know how charges are made in terms of the internal service fund. And I want to make sure that there's no duplication, so that we're not being billed twice or multiple times or not at all. So I think this is

an area that we're going to have to pursue with a more vigorous -- it has to be shared with the Legislature,

Mario --

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER CHIANG: -- to make sure that people have a better sense of what our obligations are. And in view of what's taking place throughout municipal government and the problems with finances, I want to make sure that we don't have a growing problem with any of the areas that we have jurisdiction over.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: We certainly appreciate that, Controller Chiang. The staff is concerned with the inability to keep track of the local grantees and the funds that they expend. We did investigate Redondo Beach some years ago and found some irregularities. And since that time, we've even lost more of our accounting and auditing staff, so it's been difficult to do that.

So we appreciate your support on that.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: All right. Well, at least -- and so we'll take up all the other items that haven't been pulled from the consent calendar.

Are there any public comment? Anyone wish to speak to the items that remain on the consent calendar? Seeing none, we'll close public comment.

1 We have a motion to approve the remaining items 2 on the consent calendar? 3 ACTING COMMISSIONER KLASS: So moved. 4 COMMISSIONER CHIANG: Second. 5 CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Without objection. 6 And on those two remaining items, again the 7 Sacramento Rail, we'll bring that up to another regular 8 scheduled meeting, and C 12 we'll continue to, I guess, 9 the call of the Chair --10 EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: Okay. 11 CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: -- and work through some of those issues. 12 13 What's next here? We've got Item 38. That's to 14 consider sponsorship to the legislation. And we've got 15 Mario at the helm. And we'll have Jan Brisco speak 16 momentarily. 17 Mario, I guess this is your last hurrah. 18 LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: Well, good 19 afternoon, Mr. Chair and commissioners. Thank you for the 20 kind words. I'm glad that you decided to do that before 21 my presentation --22 (Laughter.) 23 LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: -- before I 24 dump eight legislative proposals on you and then bolt.

(Laughter.)

25

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.)

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: So today I'll be presenting eight legislative proposals to you. After each proposal I'll provide you with staff's recommendation on each item.

Feel free to ask any questions during my presentation. Traditionally, what's been done is I've given the whole presentation. And then at the end, the commissioners take action on each item.

And so I suggest doing the same, but I'll leave that up to your discretion.

--000--

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: The first legislative item has to do with our rent-free piers. According to statute, Public Resources Code 6503.5, the State Lands Commission shall not charge rent for recreational piers on State lands for private recreational use when the owner is the littoral landowner.

Here you'll see a picture of -- a snapshot of
Huntington Harbor where there are several homes here with
recreational piers that are rent free. This is a small
snapshot of Huntington Harbor, which has several more.
This is the channel here that is subject to the Public
Trust. There was a boundary line determination in the

sixties, so it's pretty clear-cut where the boundary line is and that these recreational piers are on State lands.

I should say that staff is going through its records right now, and we believe that there are well over 1,000 recreational piers and buoys under the State Lands Commission's direct jurisdiction that are rent free.

--000--

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: I'll explain why President Reagan's picture is up there in a moment. (Laughter.)

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: The problems associated with the rent-free rec piers is that it deprives the State of millions of dollars of revenue. We determined that a few years ago the average for each pier and buoy is about \$1,600 a year.

There's also a problem with unequal treatment. As you're aware, we have legislative grantees. And they -- the local governments with these grants manage their Public Trust Lands pursuant to the legislative statute that granted the lands. So in, for example, Lake County, Clear Lake has several recreational piers. They are administered under the 1973 legislative grant of trust lands to the County of Lake. And they're required to charge rent for structures on State lands. As such, a Clear Lake property owner with a recreational pier pays

rent to the local government. It needs to be used for Public Trust purposes of course.

This is not the situation in areas like Lake

Tahoe and Huntington Harbor, where you have ungranted

lands, and these lands are subject to the Public Resources

Code that I just referred to.

Another issue is that there's been this notion that these piers serve a substantial public benefit. And actually in 1977 - you can see here I cited the statute - the Legislature made this finding that there was a substantial benefit to the public, because these piers acted as safe havens in cases of emergencies. But the reality is that these piers are for private exclusive use, and that if you were to tie your boat up to one of these piers or enter the pier, you could be charged with trespassing. It's only out of necessity or in the case of emergency that you can actually use these piers as a member of the public.

I put Ronald Reagan's picture up there because in 1968 one of the -- the first attempt that we know of of the Commission or of the State trying to repeal this statute was under the administration -- under Ronald Reagan's administration as Governor. And the Commission, at that point, was made up of all republicans, including the director -- Ronald Reagan's director of finance. And

they agreed to sponsor legislation. And they cited, among other reasons, that it's very difficult to determine when a pier is used for recreational use or commercial use. 4 And we've had -- we've noticed that problem recently, that 5 you have these rent-free recreational piers, but the 6 upland owner is renting them out -- they're renting a 7 property out for vacation purposes and the pier is part of it or they're renting the pier itself.

1

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So our recommendation is to -- is for the Commission to sponsor legislation to repeal this Public Resources Code as well as the statute in 1977, Chapter 431. That's actually in addition to the staff report. Ι didn't include that statute as a recommended item, and I would suggest -- or I'd recommend including that if you decide to take action on this item.

There's actually a bill already introduced by Senator Pavley on this item. And so our sponsorship would be very helpful in terms of making this bill move through the process.

--000--

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: The second legislative proposal is a fairly clean-cut proposal. Ιt involves Chula Vista. On December 10th, 2010, the Commission approved a land exchange agreement. received 97 acres of land, leased this over to the Port of San Diego. Port of San Diego will use this land for low density development to improve and enhance the -- or I should say preserve and enhance the wetland area over there, parks, open space, bike trails. As part of that agreement, the State Lands Commission agreed to pursue legislation to grant those lands to the Port of San Diego pursuant to the Port Act.

And so the recommendation is that the Commission, in fact, sponsor this legislation.

--000--

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: The third legislative proposal has to do with vessels and ground tackle. You may recall a few years ago the Commission endeavored to accomplish the same -- or address this same issue through legislation. It was ultimately vetoed for what we think are erroneous reasons, but I'll get into that in a second.

The problem with vessels and ground tackle is that we're seeing in growing numbers that there are derelict vessels being abandoned or permanently moored on State lands without any sort of approval. This creates blight. It is an attractive nuisance. People can get injured on them. There's hazardous material on some of these boats. And we have to -- if we want to address this problem -- and we've had a retired annuitant, Peter

Pelkofer, who's been pretty diligent and ambitious in terms of addressing this issue.

We filed a lawsuit against, for example, there's the Spirit of Sacramento here, which I think will be mentioned in one of the land management discussions. We entered into a lawsuit against the owner of this boat. It took about three years I think of litigation. I want to say about a thousand hours of Attorney General's time. That comes to about over a thousand dollars in legal services, and that doesn't even -- a hundred thousand dollars in legal services. It doesn't even include State Land staff's time in the matter. And the reason why we have to go to court is because we can't order disposal administratively of these vessels because of property rights that the owner has in these type of vessels.

And so what staff is suggesting -- let's see if I can get to the next slide here -- no, that's not doing it. --000--

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: Okay. Well, I handed out the PowerPoint slides there.

Thank you.

Staff is suggesting creating an administrative authority within the Commission to order removal and disposal of these vessels. Now, the -- we don't contemplate using any General Fund money. This is a

discretionary act and the Commission may do this if there are available opportunities there to dispose of the vessels. If we have a ship recycler; if we have third-party funding; if we have a willing federal, State, or local agency wanting to get rid of this vessel, we would utilize those resources to dispose of these vessels. So the Commission would get this item, would decide that this boat is derelict and trespassing or abandoned and should not be on State lands, and order removal and disposal. And that would give staff the legal authority to remove these vessels. So the staff's recommendation is to sponsor this bill.

I mentioned before that it was vetoed. The Governor stated that there were hidden costs to this program and that Boating and Waterways had an abandoned boat program. And we asserted time and time again that there were no hidden costs that we intended. We had identified ship recyclers that were willing to take these vessels. And we were working with other agencies.

--000--

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: And then as far as Boating and Waterways program goes, their program -- they have a grant program where they give money to local governments to remove abandoned recreational vessels. And as you can see from the picture that I showed before, a

lot of these vessels are commercial vessels, and so the Boating and Waterways program does not apply.

2.4

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Who sponsored that bill?

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: We sponsored that bill in '09. It was introduced by Senator Wolk. It received only one "no" vote throughout the whole process.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: It was still vetoed?

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: It was still vetoed.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: And would you be looking to go right back to Wolk or -- and sort of brought the same process back?

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: Senator Wolk has indicated that she's interested in this bill.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Okay.

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: The fourth proposal is also a proposal that you've seen in the past in 2000 --

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Excuse me.

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: Yes, go ahead.

COMMISSION CHIANG: Have we contemplated imposing financial liability on people who've disposed of these boats?

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: I would say it's been contemplated. It's not part of this proposal.

There's no reason why we can't consider it, or if you'd like to make it part of that -- part of your motion to incorporate administrative fines.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER CHIANG: Well, I'd like to get additional thinking by staff, because the -- not only are we doing a cleanup, but I want to discourage that type of irresponsible practice.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: Yes, Commissioner Chianq. Item 7 that Mario will be getting to is actually a similar bill dealing with trespasses. And in that instance, there is a revision for fining people. And so that -- depending on the circumstances, it may be something that we want to fine people to incentivize them to remove it themselves. But if they're judgment proof or whatever, then we still need the authority be able to go in there and remove that. We've had that kind of circumstance where it wouldn't do any good to even fine somebody, because they have no assets or they left the state, but the Commission still would have to go into court under current conditions. And so we want to clarify that as to that Item No. 3.

COMMISSIONER CHIANG: If you could -- I don't know if any other state has engaged in this type of practice. And I don't want you to have to do research if we don't have the resources, but if somebody has a quick

sense, you know, obviously I'd like to get additional information and I'm sure the other commissioners would.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: Well, currently there is a fund for recreational vessels that the Department of Boating and Waterways handles. The problem with that is it's not available to State agencies. And so unless the local government, the city or county, wants to take that responsibility -- we're talking about lands under the Commission's jurisdiction that we can't get anybody to take responsibility for in many instances. Certain counties are very proactive, others are not. So this would give the Commission the authority to take those actions.

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: And the trespass bill that I'll be talking about does not deal with vessels. And when we developed this bill in '09, we weren't -- as Curtis was saying, these are, for the most part, insolvent people that are -- that have these vessels or abandon them. And there is a provision in the Wolk bill that allows us to go after the individual for costs, but that involves a court action. And we can look into perhaps turning that into an administrative process to impose fines.

COMMISSIONER CHIANG: I'd be interested in that.

I'm not sure everybody's judgment proof. But to the

extent that they're not, that may be an additional tool in our tool kit.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Let me reinforce that. I mean, if I threw a garbage can's worth of things, I should be fined, let alone a vessel on State property, and we're picking up the cost. It seems to be -- you know, I hate the phrase "no-brainer" because it's not particularly eloquent or thoughtful, but this is a no-brainer.

And I think administratively there's hardship waivers, there's all kind -- I mean, I understand, you know, people's difficulty. But, my gosh, looking at least at the slides you showed, these are hardly modest little vessels that people are dumping. So I think there's absolute wisdom in looking at that; and looking at best practices to the extent that there are, you know, other agencies that are doing the same.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: And that is part of the problem with the Boating and Waterways program, it only involves recreational vessels. And as you pointed out, a number of these vessels we're dealing with have -- had been commercial in the past and somebody buys them for a dollar and then they go out there and sink or just abandon them and nobody takes responsibility of their own on Commission's property.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Good. Well, let's -- yeah,

I look forward to you coming back with some recommendations.

2.4

--000--

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: The fourth legislative proposal is a proposal that was sponsored by the Commission in '09. And it has to do with mining leases and quitclaims. And it was vetoed because the Governor said that it was a solution looking for a problem, which is not the case.

What happens is that the Commission issues leases to mining companies, who then mine the lands. And then once they're done mining the lands, they go into reclamation. Well, the law allows a mining lessee to quitclaim their lease to the State Lands Commission before they go into reclamation.

What happens then is that the mining company occupies the land during reclamation, can use it in some cases to store equipment, and does not pay rent to the State nor is obligated to comply with the insurance or bond requirements of the lease. There's no incentive for them to hurry up the reclamation process.

Meanwhile, we're stuck with a piece of land that we can't lease out and that we're not generating any revenue from.

There's one example in Lake County where there's

```
a mining company, a gold mining company, that quitclaimed their lease ten years ago and is still in the reclamation process. And there are a few other cases, and we cited these to the Governor, but still he classified it as a solution in search of a problem.
```

2.4

And so I would like -- I recommend that the Commission take another shot at this and sponsor legislation that will require the State Lands Commission's approval of a quitclaim of a lease before it actually takes effect.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: And again, this was vetoed last year?

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: In '09.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: '09? And the veto message was solution in search of a problem?

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Even though you identified that one specific example, and I imagine you may have others?

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: Several examples were cited in our bill --

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: And the sponsor of that? I mean, I know obvious it came out of this Commission.

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: Was

Assemblywoman Nancy Skinner, who, at the time, was the

Chair of the Natural Resources --

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: And is interested in carrying this again?

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: She's being approached.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Okay.

--000--

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: The fifth legislative item deals with our Marine Invasive Species program.

I divided the amendments into -- or the bill proposal into three categories:

One is a set of technical changes, changing terminology referring to -- for our whole fouling statutes referring to the wetted parts of the vessel instead of the submerged parts of the vessel, because you still have fouling occurring on areas that are not necessarily submerged.

There is an extension of a grandfathering date, which was originally 2008, for experimental systems approved by the federal government. Experimental ballast water systems, I should say. And staff feels that the grandfathering clause should be extended to 2016 to allow these federally approved experimental ballast water treatment systems to be operated in State waters for

research and development purposes.

2.4

And then the third category is aimed at protecting the Marine Invasive Species Act. There is a provision in the Marine Invasive Species Act when it was -- around the time when it was first enacted that says not until -- or until 2010 no agency can impose requirements pertaining to marine invasive species from a vessel that is different from those standards in the Marine Invasive Species Act. Well, 2010 has come and gone, and we've seen potential conflicts in other State agencies' requirements that have little or no resources dedicated to marine invasive species.

We've seen them consider requirements that conflict with our -- with the Marine Invasive Species Act and could actually negate huge portions of our program.

So we suggest extending this 2010 date to either 2020 or make it indefinite. The recommendation is to sponsor this legislation.

--000--

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: The sixth legislative proposal deals with sea level rise. It is sponsored by the Commissioner -- or the Controller. And last year the Commission supported this bill. It was authored at that time -- introduced by Assemblywoman Brownley. And I think because of miscommunication or

because of the budget situation or it being last minute, it was held on the suspense calendar in the last house, which was the Senate, in the Appropriations Committee.

This bill would have -- would require planning -or would require local trustees or grantees of Public

Trust Lands to plan and prepare for sea level rise. Some
of the requirements include assessments of sea level rise,
maps, determination of the costs of sea level rise,
measures and time tables. We're not actually requesting
that these be implemented, but we're requesting a plan.

We did a survey, as you recall, a few years ago where we
found -- where we surveyed over 100 trustees and lessees
and only 40 responded. And of those 40, very few were
ready for sea level rise or planning for sea level rise at
all.

This bill provides exemptions for trustees that either will not be affected by sea level rise, that the revenue -- or the expense of preparing the plan substantially outweighs the benefit of preparing for sea level rise. And the third exception is if a trustee does not have significant -- or sufficient trust revenues to pay for the plan.

Staff recommends that the Commission support this legislation this year.

I should say that last year I believe the Port of

San Diego supported this as well as San Francisco -- Port of San Francisco. They are both preparing their sea level rise plan, so they're ahead of the game.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

--000--

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: The seventh proposal involves trespass. This was also a bill that Commission sponsored last year and was authored by Assemblyman Chesbro.

I have to say that when I first started working for the State Lands Commission I had a conversation with our -- I had a meeting with our chief counsel at that time, Jack Rump, and I asked him what is one of the biggest legislative issues that we should address -- or what is the biggest issue that we should address legislatively. And he said trespass. He explained to me - and I confirmed by looking through our records - that we are regularly dealing with trespassing structures and facilities on State lands. Our only remedy is to take these structures and facilities to court for removal or to get them under a lease. This involves, as in the abandoned vessel case, significant Attorney General time and money, significant staff time and money. And there's really no deterrent for a trespasser when they're making that initial decision whether or not they are going to construct something on a navigable waterway.

either have to remove it later on or pay back rent or come under a lease. And so there's really nothing to prevent them from moving forward on their trespass.

We've seen this problem with fences. We've seen this problem with -- fences to keep out the public from certain rivers and lakes. We've seen this with piers and docks. This picture here is a dock in the Delta that -- it's a boathouse. I believe Lieutenant Governor Garamendi referred to it as a frat house.

(Laughter.)

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: It has a full kitchen upstairs. It has a shower. It has a toilet, and a gigantic area for a boat, but I don't believe was parked there.

The Commission spent about three years litigating this issue, when all it wanted the owner to do was conform the structure to a structure that would be suitable for -- or that was approved by the Commission.

We've also dealt with private bridges, believe it or not. A mining company built three private bridges over the San Joaquin River without authorization.

--000--

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: So after having this conversation with our chief counsel at the time, I went to a conference with our counterparts from the

western states, and I asked them, "What exactly do you do to deal with these trespassing issues?" And representatives from Texas and Oregon -- I don't think there was a representative from Washington -- told me that they have statutes and regulations that impose administrative fines and allow administrative orders to remove these structures.

And so I looked at their statutes and their regulations, and I discovered that Washington has similar statutes and regulations, and modeled the bill off of this. It was AB 2664 last year.

There are other agencies in the State that have similar administrative finding authority, BCDC. One of the complaints that we got at the end of last year's session was that there would be -- there are due process concerns. And my response to that is, well, first of all, there are other states that have virtually the identical program as being proposed here without due process issues; that there are other State agencies that do the same without due process issues; and the Civil Code and the Government Code are filled with statutes to protect due process in administrative actions. There's actually an administrative adjudication bill of rights. There's a whole mechanism to appeal an administrative decision to the trial court. And so I feel that there are significant

due process protections in place.

Ultimately, I think those arguments led to the veto message -- well, the Governor cited these due process concerns in his veto message, and that's what ultimately ended up killing the bill.

So I think with a new governor this year, I'd recommend that the Commission sponsor a similar bill this year.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: And, Mario, what was the result in the Legislature on the bill as far as how it passed?

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: Well, at first it passed unanimously through the Assembly. But then once I think some of the special interest groups came out against it, the vote was along party lines, but it still passed both houses.

--000--

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: And then the last legislative proposal, probably one of the -- the most if not -- it's probably the most important legislative proposal on this list. It's dealing with our Oil Spill Prevention program. The Lempert-Keene-Seastrand Act in 1990 created the State's current oil spill prevention programs, and mostly administered by Fish and Game's Office of Spill Prevention and Response and the State

Lands Commission.

This program is funded by a fee imposed on oil that goes over the docks at marine terminals, a 4-cent-per-barrel fee, as well as a \$2,500 fee on non-tank vessels, which a non-tank vessel is charged once every two years.

The program standards are best achievable protection, and so the program is constantly growing and improving. And we've seen that here with the creation of our MOTEMS program, our Marine Oil Terminal Engineering Standards, and other measures that we've taken to prevent oil spill prevention -- or to prevent oil spills. And we've had a huge success rate. I think Kevin will explain later on what the success rate is. But it's pretty remarkable over the last few years the lack of oil spills at marine terminals.

The fees that are currently being -- that are funding these programs go into the OSPAF, Oil Spill Prevention Administration Fund. The revenues generated are significantly less than the cost of these programs. We're already operating at -- well, next year we're projected to operate at a deficit that -- projections show about 2.3 million next year in a deficit. Although there's some creative budgeting and accounting that may temporarily prevent any cuts to the programs next year.

But those creative accounting measures will likely not take effect -- or not last any longer than that one fiscal year. And so if you look at 2012 to 2013's projected deficit, we're looking over \$8 million in the program, which will ultimately lead to cuts, which we've yet to determine how those cuts would take place and hoping that they don't have to.

So our recommendation is to support an increase in the fee. And I should say that the Lempert-Keene-Seastrand Act in 1990 imposed a 4-cent-per-barrel fee over oil coming over the docks. It's only been increased once since then to 5 cents in 2002 or 2003. And so in our 20-year program we've only had a 1-cent increase, and which has not really -- it doesn't match the increase in -- if you ask profits made off of gas, the increased expenses that our programs are incurring.

So we're looking for an increase in the fee that will meet our program's needs today. But we're also interested in possibly pursuing an adjuster, like a CPI adjuster, that will allow the program to continue its success and ensure funding so that every five to six years we're not having to go to the Commission and the Legislature to ask for more money.

And that concludes my presentation.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: How large is the staff that currently is funded with this fee? And has it grown substantially over the years?

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: The State Lands staff is 90. That does not account for oil spill -- the OSPR's staff, that is funded from the same pot.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: All right. And excuse my ignorance. I mean, this fee supports how many staff members?

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CHIEF BROWN:

Ninety of State Lands.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: So the fee supports 98 FTs.

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CHIEF BROWN: Over 200,

Fish and Game.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: And 200 at Fish and Game?

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CHIEF BROWN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: And have those numbers grown substantially over the years, meaning the number of staff?

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CHIEF BROWN: The initial program at State Lands Commission had 60 positions.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Initial, going back to the origins of the original fee?

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CHIEF BROWN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Sixty positions and now 98?

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CHIEF BROWN: Ninety.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Ninety. Okay. Excuse me, 90.

All right. And what, have the duties been commensurate with the staff increase? Or what's -- I mean, have we done an analysis? Are we overstaffed, understaffed? I know the concern -- I mean, obviously I've never heard anyone in a department say we're understaffed. Which it means if you don't like the answer, ask a better question -- let me come up with a better question.

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: This is Kevin Mercier. He's our Acting Chief of our Marine Facilities Division.

MARINE FACILITIES DIVISION ACTING CHIEF MERCIER:

Yes, sir. You're right, nobody's going to say
that we're understaffed -- we're overstaffed. I'm sorry.

The program has grown because as we've -- since we started in '91, we've got smarter on how to prevent oil spills at marine facilities. You'll see later what we've been doing in the engineering side of things. You know, we are now the first state, nationality, or anyplace else that's requiring marine terminals to actually rehabilitate themselves. These structures were built -- you know, the newest one in California that's not DOD was built in the seventies. Before that most of these things were built in

the thirties and the forties.

2.4

There's never been a requirement for them to be looked at, inspected, rehabbed or anything else. And we're doing that now. Staff has grown to accommodate that.

We took on some additional responsibilities over the years. We've included security. After 911, we were the first State agency and the first agency in the United States really that applied security responsibilities at oil terminals. Our premise is always prevention of oil spills. But obviously if somebody blows up a marine terminal, there's likely to be a spill, so we put in security measures.

So our program has grown by adding enhancements to the program to be better prepared and prevent oil spills.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: All right. And those enhancements -- security enhancements were not aided by federal resources or --

MARINE FACILITIES DIVISION ACTING CHIEF MERCIER:
No, sir.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: -- or grants? Those all come from State sources?

MARINE FACILITIES DIVISION ACTING CHIEF MERCIER:

They were all from this barrel tax, yes, sir --

barrel fee.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Fee, right.

MARINE FACILITIES DIVISION ACTING CHIEF MERCIER:

And we added some staff awhile back to look more closely at marine facilities, and I'll explain quickly later. But facilities are more than just the oil terminals. Facilities also include, you know, tank farms that might just take care of small boats. There are size restrictions, but they're spelled out in the act themselves. But we have staff that goes out and inspects these marine facilities because, frankly, nobody else was doing it. So we've added -- we've taken on those responsibilities, because it's in the mandate of something we should do and so we did it.

So the program has grown from 60 to 90. Not all of those are in my division. We've also added -- some of the responsibilities in the Mineral Resources Management Division was shifted to the Oil Spill Act over the years because, frankly, that's where it belonged. The inspection of the offshore terminals is also geared to preventing oil spills, and so some of those responsibilities were absorbed in the OSPAF.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: I appreciate that.

And I apologize if I just zoned out on the fee.

25 What are we recommending in terms of fee increase?

MARINE FACILITIES DIVISION ACTING CHIEF MERCIER: 1 Well, I don't think we've come up with the number 2 3 yet, sir. 4 CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: All right. At least there's 5 a reason I didn't hear it then. 6 (Laughter.) 7 MARINE FACILITIES DIVISION ACTING CHIEF MERCIER: 8 Well, yes, sir. 9 CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: And so the next obvious question, are we talking 1 cent, are we talking 10 cents? 10 11 What is the estimate, and how does that work vis-a-vis your staffing levels, et cetera? Could we look at what 12 that could be? 13 14 MARINE FACILITIES DIVISION ACTING CHIEF MERCIER: 15 Can I stick it in and then call it an estimate? 16 Do you want to do that? 17 LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: Well, I'd say 18 that we want to work cooperatively with Department of Fish 19 and Game's Oil Spill Prevention Response Office, OSPR. 20 And they are putting together a formula or a suggested 21 increase. And so I don't think that they've shared that 22 with us yet. They need to get approval from the

And so we wanted to work with them to come up

Governor's office, and I'm not sure if they've received

that, to go out and promote their increase.

23

24

25

with that number, that fee increase. And it just hasn't happened yet.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Okay. Just so I understand - and to the Executive Officer - you want us to support a fee increase, but we don't know what that increase is? Or do you want to support legislation that would be the vehicle where we'd subsequently come back and make a determination on whether or not that vehicle, as drafted, is appropriate?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: Yeah, I believe at this time, Mr. Chair, that the staff would like to have the support of the Commission for the concept of raising the fee without knowing what that is.

We certainly can bring it back to you when we hear from Fish and Game. Fish and Game actually manages the funds for the State. And the Commission gets a percentage of that to sponsor its program.

We anticipate it could be something like a cent, it could be less. We don't know. There's a long-term shortage that's showing up the trends. There was a surplus, and that's being drawn down very quickly.

We have met with WSPA, who are the organization that represents the shippers on this. They spoke at our meeting in Culver City in October. And while they have concerns about increasing the fund, because they want to

make sure the funds are being properly used - we've been meeting with them and going over the issues with them - we think their primary concern has been with the Department of Fish and Game's expense rather than the Commission's.

But we're kind of tied together with Fish and Game on this, and so we have to -- we're cooperating with them.

And depending on how the Governor's office is going to be handling that, we'll be proceeding.

2.4

But we can certainly keep all the Commissioners involved in that issue, and communicate back to us. And we will take it -- we'll bring it back to the next Commission meeting to tell you what the status of any progress on the bill would be.

MARINE FACILITIES DIVISION ACTING CHIEF MERCIER:

If I may. OSPR has publicly stated that they
were looking at a penny and a half increase.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: Okay.

MARINE FACILITIES DIVISION ACTING CHIEF MERCIER:

We've told them we're convinced that's not enough, you know. Now, whether it's 2 cents more or -- but there's some other variables on the non-tank vessel side which comes into how much money they can charge the non-tank vessels --

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: And that's been that \$2,500 for a vessel --

MARINE FACILITIES DIVISION ACTING CHIEF MERCIER:
Right. And they're looking at going up to 3,200 perhaps.

So there are some numbers. But we've been talking to OSPR and we're kind of negotiating -- first of all, getting -- both of us getting the approval to proceed to look at these things closer. And then I think we can come together on a real number that not only takes care of the status quo, but it will take care of us in the future as well.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: I see.

Well, I appreciate this dialogue. And to the extent that there is a fee increase, obviously I appreciate the Executive Officer could come back for consideration. I don't want to necessarily just sign a blank check. That being said -- without justification and being able to reach out to the impacted parties, et cetera, and make sure we do the due diligence. And there's always efficiencies. And it sounds like there's a lot of opportunity here with Fish and game and the Commission to start coordinating and organizing some of those long-standing issues differently around potentially this fee increase.

So I certainly have no problem - and I'm speaking for myself, obviously not my colleagues - supporting the

discussion. And I guess that's it. The way this reads is we're supporting legislation as an action item. And that's where I get a little bit -- these questions are coming from basically.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: Understood. And to some degree, I may be regretting that we didn't do the division chiefs' PowerPoint presentation earlier so that you'd have a better sense of what some of the activities that we've been involved in in the success of the programs. And if it's the commissioners' desire, we could certainly postpone a vote on this until after that, if that's helpful. Otherwise, we could proceed.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Well, I think -- look, any fee going back this many years and the work that we're doing -- and the fact is you're doing outstanding work.

And I have intimate appreciation of that being my old job that I had a few weeks ago.

That being said, I have no problem -- I want you to move along. Nothing worse than folks slowing everything down, especially with these meetings that happen every so darn often. It gets a little frustrating, I imagine.

But in terms of just specific recommendations, I hope that we can caution some consideration back to the Commission to support or defend or oppose or amend those

specific recommendations. But that's my own feeling. I don't know, colleagues, if you have any thoughts on it.

COMMISSIONER CHIANG: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Please.

COMMISSIONER CHIANG: First question -- whatever the fee is, it's probably de minimis. But can we get something from WSPA if they have elasticity of demand, increasing of -- where it goes down the channels and down the chains and what its impact is going to be?

And then, second, if staff can explain, with the recent law changes, all the expenditures from this fee, is it still a majority vote?

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: Assemblyman
Huffman is introducing legislation, or at least is
seriously considering introducing legislation on this, and
submitted language to legislative counsel. And from what
I understand, legislative counsel sent the language back
marking it with the majority vote requirement.

And so at this point, I think -- and reviewing Proposition 26, I think that an increase in the fee meets the exception in Proposition 26 regarding inspections, investigations, and audits. And we have made an inquiry to the Attorney General's office and we're waiting for an opinion from them. But at this time, we're under the impression that a majority vote is all that's required.

COMMISSIONER CHIANG: Yeah, if you could let us know if there's any pressure points with any of the expenditures that would perhaps elevate it to the level where it would require a two-thirds vote --

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER CHIANG: -- so that we can review that and determine what would need to be done as a next step.

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: All right. Does that conclude the presentation of the --

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: That concludes it.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: -- you're proposing?

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: I'd like to
thank all of you for the opportunity you've given me to
represent the Commission at the Legislature and at the
federal government level. It's been a pleasure. We have
great leadership. We had great leadership with Paul
Thayer and Jack Rump. And you guys have left -- Curtis
always jokes because I often refer to you as you guys.

(Laughter.)

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON DE BERNARDO: Anyway, thank you again, and you've made a lasting impression on me and I hope to carry the values that you've instilled in me and

in the rest of the State forward.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER CHIANG: If you want to make sure there's a lasting impression, make sure our bills pass.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Any other comments from the Commission?

I think there's public comment on this item. I received one request to speak. But those that haven't filled out a form, just raise your hand and please speak.

But Ms. Jan Brisco.

There's Jan.

Come on up.

MS. BRISCO: Good afternoon, Chairman Newsom and commissioners.

I think your form needs to be amended, because I'm not necessarily speaking in opposition today, but wanted to share with you some concerns.

I am representing the Tahoe Lakefront Owners' Association. And we were very concerned about the last time Item No. 7 came before the Legislature, and in terms of the ability for the State Lands to go in and administratively make some removals. So we are hopeful that in the event that this legislation isn't going to move forward, that our comments about due process are

seriously considered. And I know staff has been in touch with us on that. And we are looking forward to working with them again on the -- in terms of remedies and that kind of thing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

One issue that's come up -- and I'm only speaking to Lake Tahoe. I know this is a statewide proposition. One issue that's come up for us at Lake Tahoe are the number of boathouses that have sun decks on top where you take -- you know, it houses a boat, but it also allows some sunning on top of the deck. In some cases, these structures have not been previously authorized specifically, although it is very clear that they've been there since the forties, fifties, and sixties. And so we're concerned about the staff's interpretation that those then need to be removed. And many of our lakefront owners have already complied with those removals. are concerned about what that might mean in the future in terms of administrative remedy and if there is, in fact, some concern about that.

Also, at Lake Tahoe we are very, very well regulated by other agencies having jurisdiction. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, of course, can come in and make removal requests and modification requests, as well as the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.

Another concern that we have in terms of Item No.

1 for legislation on the rent-free provision, we are hoping, because this of course is a very significant dollar amount that could come back to the State, that we take a very careful look and analyze very carefully this provision. There are -- I don't know. We heard about the number of piers and structures that enjoy the rent-free status, but we don't know about the ones and the number - and I'd be interested to know, maybe staff can let me know - the numbers who are already paying annual rent.

We at Lake Tahoe need a recognition for seasonal use. We are paying not only for the structure itself, but also a setback area as well, 10 feet to piers and a 40-foot radius for buoys. So that's a considerable amount of area that we're already paying -- would be paying for and already are paying.

The number of cases that might exhibit hardship -- although everyone thinks that if you have a pier, somehow it's an open checkbook here. But we want you to know we have a lot of families with inherited properties and that kind of thing who this will be considered a hardship for. So we want the staff and the Legislature to consider that.

And, lastly, that the percentage of any of these fees that might go back to Lake Tahoe in the form of environmental improvement and some of the goals that we're

trying to achieve at Lake Tahoe would be -- if there's a consideration for that as well, we'd like that to be something -- we'd like the Legislature to consider as well.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Thank you, Ms. Brisco.

Any other public comment?

Again, I just have this one card. But just in case, to be fair.

Seeing none, we'll close public comment.

Mr. Executive Officer, any final comments before we ask Commission members their thoughts?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: Only in response to Ms. Brisco's comments.

I think staff certainly tries to work with all the property owners and the public up there as well. And the decks issue has become one of -- somewhat of concern. What we have found that is -- while the Commission has in the past approved docks, they didn't always approve decks. If we find that either the Commission was aware or that the staff was aware that these decks existed, we have not been asking that they be removed, at least unless the entire pier or 50 percent of it needs to be rehabilitated. But we do charge rent for that, because that is not part of the rent-free pier lease. The deck would be for their

private recreational use, not associated with the boats.

So we have a number of leases the Commission has approved even recently that did include decks. What we do is not recommend any new decks be created in those areas.

As to the paying the rent and seasonal use, that's something that we've certainly looked at for those people who are paying rent. We don't have the number right now of the percentage. I would think that the percentage of upland owners who are paying rent is relatively small, probably less than 10 percent. But we do have many commercial marinas at Tahoe and other places.

And the buoys, the same thing. They aren't generally used all year long for the most part.

The hardships -- the Commission has had several people appear at recent meetings with the issue of hardships. We all know that property owners throughout the State who have lost a lot of value in their property and lost income for various reasons have difficulty making payments on their mortgages and whatnot. We certainly understand that. But at the same time, we also understand the hardship the State's going through with the budget. And when -- I think when we were talking about it earlier, we would expect that the average rent for a pier up there might be something in the neighborhood of \$1,200, \$1,500. We don't know exactly at this point. But that doesn't

seem like a substantial amount of money to compensate them, because we believe these piers add hundreds of thousands of dollars, if not millions of dollars, to the value of the upland property.

So we're happy to not only meet with representatives of the homeowners' association but work with them on this. And we're pleased that they are looking at what environmental improvements might be able to be had with some of these funds. We certainly are looking at that as well.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Any comments, Commission?

So that's the legislative agenda.

Is there a motion to approve?

COMMISSIONER CHIANG: So moved.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Second?

You abstain?

ACTING COMMISSIONER KLASS: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Conflicts of interest?

ACTING COMMISSIONER KLASS: Exactly.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Is that it?

All right. Well, we'll move it forward without objection.

And, Mr. Executive Officer, is there any other business? Or, Mario, you have something else to add? Or were we --

EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: Mario was just pointing out that his oral representation as to the repeal of the chapter as well as the code section be made part of the recommendation to the Commission.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Good. I think that's -- officially your last act. Why not.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Yeah, that's good.

And the next order of business?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

At this time, we'll be happy to present a short introduction to some of the activities the Commission staff is conducting on your behalf. Each of our division chiefs will provide a short PowerPoint discussion of the work the divisions are involved in.

The Commission and the people of California are very fortunate to have such a highly experienced and dedicated professional staff serving them. The division chiefs average over 20 years of State service, and some have decades of prior experience. The staffs they manage are likewise made up of many experienced professionals.

The last year has seen a lot of transition in the agency's management. Four of the six divisions had chiefs retire or move on last year and one the prior year.

That leaves only our Administrative Division Chief, with 20 years in the role and 31 years with the Commission, as being well tenured.

The former executive officer, with 11 years in that role, also retired last year.

So we have some experienced staff taking over new roles. And I would like to introduce them to you and have them explain the roles their divisions play on your behalf.

First off, Jennifer Lucchesi, our Chief Counsel.

Jennifer came to the Commission in 1999 and has risen
through the ranks. Jennifer's an expert in public trust
issues and has been involved in many urban waterfront
renewal projects for more than a decade.

CHIEF COUNSEL LUCCHESI: Good afternoon.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was

Presented as follows.)

--000--

CHIEF COUNSEL LUCCHESI: The Legal Division's primary functions are to provide program-specific legal support to the Commission and its staff and to provide litigation support to the Attorney General's office.

--000--

CHIEF COUNSEL LUCCHESI: The Legal Division's eight attorneys provide legal support to the Commission's

five other divisions that you'll hear about shortly.

--000--

2.4

CHIEF COUNSEL LUCCHESI: The Legal Division has nine objectives:

The first objective is to assist in the identification, location, and protection of title, boundaries and mineral rights of sovereign and State-owned lands.

The Legal Division also assists the Commission in the resolution of title disputes through boundary line agreements, land exchanges, title settlements, and, if necessary, litigation.

In 2010 the Commission approved title settlements at the Oak to Ninth project site in Oakland, at the Del Mar Fairgrounds in San Diego, and along the Chula Vista bayfront in San Diego County.

Looking forward to 2011-2012, staff anticipates that many other title settlements will be brought to the Commission for consideration, including settlements at Candlestick, Hunters Point, and Treasure Island in San Francisco and Marina Park in Newport Beach, along Mission Bay in San Diego, and at the Pike in Long Beach.

--000--

CHIEF COUNSEL LUCCHESI: Legal staff aids in the comprehensive planning of State lands for the appropriate

type of development and/or protection of those lands consistent with Public Trust Doctrine. This past year Legal staff, for example, worked closely with the Port of San Francisco to bring the Exploratorium Science Museum to the San Francisco waterfront.

--000--

CHIEF COUNSEL LUCCHESI: Staff provides legal services for the protection of publicly owned lands through lease enforcement, surveillance, and litigation such as trespass actions.

--000--

CHIEF COUNSEL LUCCHESI: Staff provides the Commission and its staff with legal assistance and advice in the management of oil, gas, geothermal and other mineral resources.

Commission attorneys are actively involved in questions regarding the development, negotiation, and interpretation of leases, contracts, development proposals, and royalty and rent accounting.

Staff also assists in the development of legislation and regulations to protect and develop State lands. Staff provides the Commission with day-to-day advise necessary for the accomplishment of program objectives consistent with constitutional, and statutory, and regulatory compliance.

--000--

CHIEF COUNSEL LUCCHESI: Legal staff provides the Commission and the public with advice on public rights of access and use of California waterways.

One example is Speedboat Beach at Lake Tahoe where the Commission last year, in exercising the Public Trust easement, facilitated the removal of a fence installed by private upland homeowners which blocked public access to the lake.

--000--

CHIEF COUNSEL LUCCHESI: Finally, Legal staff assists the Office of the Attorney General in preparation for and prosecution of litigation. Legal staff also represents the Commission at trial and on appeal in those cases where the Attorney General's office has a conflict of interest or otherwise declines to represent the Commission.

The Commission attorneys are currently, for example, working with the Attorney General's office in negotiating a settlement agreement where the State is compensated for the impact of the Cosco Busan oil spill and the impacts that had on birds, mammals, habitat, and the human use of its affected lands.

That concludes my presentation. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Thank you.

```
Please, Commissioner.
1
 2
             ACTING COMMISSIONER KLASS: Jennifer, I'm
 3
    sorry --
             EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: Commissioner Klass.
 4
5
             ACTING COMMISSIONER KLASS: Thank you.
             I'm sorry, Jennifer, if I missed it. Could you
6
7
    give me a couple of sentences on your background.
8
    you from another State agency or the AG or --
9
             CHIEF COUNSEL LUCCHESI: No, actually I started
10
    with the Commission in the Land Management Division about
11
    11 years ago.
12
             ACTING COMMISSIONER KLASS: Oh, okay. Great.
13
    Thank you.
14
             EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: Second up will be Greg
15
    Scott. He's our Chief of the Mineral Resources Management
16
   Division. Greg has been a petroleum engineer with the
17
    Commission for 22 years and had 20 years experience in the
18
    oil industry before that.
19
             Greg was appointed chief of the division in 2009.
20
             (Thereupon an overhead presentation was
             Presented as follows.)
21
             MINERAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF
22
23
    SCOTT: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair and commissioners.
                                                           МУ
24
   name is Greg Scott. I'm the Division Chief of the
25
    Commission's Mineral Resources Management located in Long
```

Beach.

2.4

This division is responsible for the safe and sound management of all the energy and mineral resources on lands under the jurisdiction of the State Lands Commission. The State's resources include oil, gas, geothermal energy, gold, and other solid minerals.

The diversity of those resources and their general areas of development are shown on this map.

Oil producing leases are located in the offshore Santa Barbara, Long Beach, and Huntington Beach areas within the State's three-mile tidelands jurisdiction.

Gas leases are located on sovereign lands under the beds of rivers and streams in the Sacramento Delta area near Rio Vista and farther north in Colusa and Sutter counties.

Significant steam production and electrical generation occurs in the geyser fields in Lake and Sonoma counties of northern California and also in Imperial County near the Salton Sea area in southern California.

And solid mineral resources such as trona, gold, and aggregate materials for road construction are being developed primarily in Inyo, San Bernardino, and Riverside counties.

--000--

MINERAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF

SCOTT: The objectives of the Mineral Resources Division are to protect and manage the development of the State's mineral resources so the State will receive their maximum value through revenue generation, while ensuring public safety and environmental protection.

--000--

MINERAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF SCOTT: Presently, there are 150 active mineral leases on the State's sovereign and school lands, accounting for approximately 95,000 acres currently under lease.

Oil production from State leases and granted lands is developed from four offshore platforms and five man-made islands and amounts to approximately 40,000 barrels of oil per day.

Gas leases account for approximately 10 million cubic feet per day.

And electrical generation from geothermal steam leases is approximately 186 megawatts, which is enough to supply the electrical demands of nearly 200,000 homes.

--000--

MINERAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF SCOTT: Royalty revenue generated from State mineral leases to the benefit of the State's General Fund and the State's Teachers' Retirement Fund during the last fiscal year was about \$321 million.

And as you can see, most of that came from oil and gas leases.

--000--

MINERAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF
SCOTT: The Mineral Resources staff is diverse in
expertise, skills, and training, but work closely together
as a team comprised of four management sections shown
here: Operation and Compliance, Planning and Development,
Engineering, and Finance and Economics.

--000--

MINERAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF
SCOTT: Operations and Compliance deals with on-site
surveillance of our lessees' oil and gas production and
processing facilities. Field inspectors monitor all
safety and pollution prevention components. They
determine how reliably they operate, how they comply with
State regulations, and whether the resources produced are
measured accurately.

In addition, comprehensive safety audits requiring several months of intensive investigation are conducted on each offshore and onshore facility every five years to verify the adequacy of their design, their ability to function properly, and the lessee's level of its commitment to safety.

And I think I might say, at this time, it would

be appropriate to comment on the Chair's interest in the Oil Spill Fund. We have 53 staff in the Division.

Approximately 30 are funded by the Oil Spill program. And those 30 positions had been funded by the General Fund prior to the inception of the Oil Spill program in 1990.

--000--

MINERAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF
SCOTT: All mineral leasing lease terms, royalty
negotiations, and lease amendments are performed by staff
within the Planning and Development Section. This section
provides project management coordination and oversight for
oil, gas, and solid mineral lease applications and works
closely with both the State Lands Commission's
Environmental and Land Management sections in Sacramento.

In addition, this section conducts regulatory reviews and updates, prepares royalty revenue forecasts for the Department of Finance, processes prospecting permits, and conducts surveys and closures of the many hazardous abandoned mines on State lands.

--000--

MINERAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF

SCOTT: Because of the complexity of most lease
facilities, we have experienced and highly trained
engineers and geologists who perform technical reviews of
all lease activities, their facility operating systems,

and their overall construction. These responsibilities include geologic analysis of oil reservoirs, well drilling design, offshore platform structural analysis and pipeline inspections, geothermal leasing and engineering, and other alternative energy project support.

As a result of lessons learned from the recent blowout in the Gulf of Mexico, we've also expanded our oversight and inspection requirements for blowout preventers on State of California offshore wells.

Division staff is also active in coastal protection programs. And as Curtis mentioned earlier, starting today we are beginning a large coastal hazard removal protect in the Santa Barbara coastal area, which is funded with federal money. And we anticipate approximately a six-month campaign to remove all of the derelict items similar to those shown in this slide here.

--000--

MINERAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF SCOTT: All royalty accounting, financial auditing, and revenue verification is performed by the Finance and Economics Section. These are essential functions to ensure that the proper royalty due the State is actually paid. As a part of this section's responsibilities, the staff verifies that proper oil prices are being applied and that only the allowed operating cost deductions are

used when determining the State's royalty payment.

Staff also performs detailed economic analysis for evaluating royalty rate when preparing lease terms. And these analyses alone have resulted in the State receiving over \$50 million in additional royalty revenues over the past 15 years.

--000--

MINERAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF SCOTT: And this is my last slide.

We're currently involved with four oil and gas development projects: Three of them offshore Santa Barbara and Ventura counties; and one offshore Los Angeles County.

We expect to present at least three of these projects for Commission consideration this year. We are also updating our oil and gas regulations that will be presented for adoption later in the year.

And in addition to oil and gas, we are involved with two solid mineral and two geothermal development projects, which we may bring to the Commission this year as well.

And that concludes my presentation of the Mineral Resources Division. Thank you.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: Thank you, Greg.

The next presentation will be made by Brian

Bugsch, the Land Management Division Chief. We were fortunate to hire Brian last year following his prior role in Lieutenant Governor Garamendi's office as the Commission's contact person. That relationship equipped him well to understand the many issues facing both the Commission and its staff.

Brian.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: Hi. Good afternoon, Commissioners.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was Presented as follows.)

--000--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: All right. I'll start with an overview of what we own.

Basically, if it's wet and it's navigable when the State -- California became a state in 1850, we probably owned it.

Sovereign lands include all State-owned tidal and submerged lands and the beds of navigable waterways, whether they were filled or unfilled. And that also includes the entire California coastline out to three miles.

--000--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: If you haven't -- If Curtis hasn't inundated you with the Public

Trust yet, you will be.

But all these sovereign lands are impressed with the Public Trust. Some of the Public Trust uses include public access, waterborne commerce, navigation, fisheries, open space, water-related recreation, and other recognized Public Trust uses.

--000--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: On the open coast, our boundaries -- on the open coast and tidal waterways, the State owns to the ordinary high water mark. On navigable non-tidal waterways, like lakes and rivers, the State owns everything below the low water mark. And we have a Public Trust easement between the low and high water mark.

And in a natural state, these boundaries are ambulatory, so they continue to move.

--000--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: This just gives you an example of some research our boundary staff looks at to determine those boundaries.

--000--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: This is an overview of our division. LMD is organized into seven working groups. If a potential project application comes in, it would usually start in our Title Unit. And they

would conduct research and determine if the State does have an interest in the property.

If we have an interest, then the Boundary Unit would determine more definitively where those interests lie and do any mapping to determine lease areas.

And then our two negotiating teams, our northern California and Delta team and our southern California and SF Bay team, these negotiators work with the applicants and lessees to develop the lease and the lease terms and work with all our other divisions to ensure compliance with the lease.

--000--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: LMD is responsible for the surface management of all sovereign and school lands in California. And there's just an example of some of the stuff that we work with.

These next few slides will give you an idea of the different types of leases that we manage.

--000--

## LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH:

Recreational pier leases in the bottom corner there, you heard about that already. They're all over the state. Commercial marinas and yacht clubs.

Marine oil terminals, which you heard Kevin talk about. Fiber optic cables and other telecommunication and

electrical lines that cross over our property.

--000--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: Dredging can range from commercial sand mining leases in the Bay Area to navigational dredging leases.

Intake and outfall pipelines.

And bank stabilization, rock revetments, sea wall caves and other mechanisms to protect upland property that people put in.

--000--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: And leases to develop and protect wetlands and habitat.

That kind of gives you the portfolio of what we deal with.

--000--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH:

Legislative grants, granted lands come under LMD.

Legislative grants are established by statute. We

currently oversee 85 grants to cities, counties, harbor

districts, and local municipalities throughout the State.

The grantees manage the day-to-day operations of these, but the Commission retains oversight authority to these granted trust lands to ensure compliance with the terms of the grant.

All of California's major ports are all within

granted lands. And there's some pictures of them.

--000--

2.4

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: School lands. I mentioned sovereign lands, but the Commission also manages school lands.

In 1853, Section 16 and 36 of each township were granted to California by Congress -- by the U.S. Congress to benefit public education. Hence the name school lands.

Originally, California had 5.5 million acres. But over time most of this has been sold off in the primary areas. And we still retained ownership to just under half a million acres of school lands, mostly in the southern California desert and in the northeast in the forest areas. And we also have an additional 790,000 acres of mineral rights on lands that we sold.

--000--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: My division, LMD, is responsible for the surface management and Greg's division is responsible for the minerals management. And revenues generated from school lands leases go to the California State Teachers' Retirement System, STRS.

--000--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: The next few slides will just show you a few of the areas that we

are working on, that are current priorities for LMD. I won't go through the litany.

Jennifer mentioned a lot of the land exchanges going on and title settlements in the Bay Area. America's Cup is going to be coming and there's a lot happening on the San Francisco waterfront.

--000--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: Renewable energy. We have various leases for -- and applications for different types of renewable energy - wind, wave, tidal, solar, and geothermal.

--000--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: Owens Lake. We're working on the master plan for the dry bed of the Owens Lake. So there's a lot of activity going on there.

--000--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: Sea level rise you heard about in the legislative proposals for the Controller.

--000--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: Lake
Tahoe. You've heard a little bit about that already, and
you'll hear more.

--000--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: Marine oil terminals. You've already been inundated with that in the legislative things, so I won't go into that.

--000--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: And the San Joaquin River restoration. Our Boundary Unit is doing a lot in the settlement aspect of this to do the actual mapping.

That's it. Thank you very much.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: Thank you, Brian.

Yeah, the last slide Brian showed we have -- the Commission has been given \$960,000 to help in that restoration project by establishing our boundaries along the area and saving acquisition costs to the project proponents.

Next up is Kevin Mercier. Kevin's an Acting
Chief of the Marine Facilities Division where he served as
assistant chief for nearly 20 years. Kevin has a depth of
experience prior to that role serving in similar roles in
the Navy for two decades.

Kevin.

2.4

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was

Presented as follows.)

MARINE FACILITIES DIVISION ACTING CHIEF MERCIER:

Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, commissioners.

You haven't heard enough about marine terminals yet.

(Laughter.)

MARINE FACILITIES DIVISION ACTING CHIEF MERCIER:

I'll give you a little bit more.

I'm Kevin Mercier. And I'll give you a brief overview of the Marine Facilities Division and the Oil Spill Prevention program.

I will be followed by Martin Eskijian, who will discuss our high visibility engineering regulations, and Maurya Falkner, who will brief you about the Marine Invasive Species program.

The first slide shows some incidents which we are designed to prevent.

In 1976 eight people died when the S.S. Sansinena blew up at earth Berth 46 in Los Angeles in San Pedro.

In February of 1990, the American Trader spilled 400,000 gallons of crude oil at the State lease in offshore Huntington Beach. And the results are the slide on the -- or the picture on the right.

That ship sat down on its own anchor while it was in the berth and punctured its hull and turned the oil loose. And it scattered from Newport Beach to Seal Beach.

Mainly because of this spill and the previous Exxon Valdez disaster, the Legislature passed the Lempert-Keene-Seastrand Oil Spill Prevention and Response Act of 1990.

2.4

The Legislature found that because of the inadequacies of cleanup and response measures, emphasis must be put on prevention. To carry out the Commission's responsibilities under the Act, the Marine Facilities Division was created.

The Act defined marine facilities as any facility where oil is handled or stored and located on marine waters or located where a discharge could impact marine waters.

Marine terminals are a subset of facilities defined as a marine facility used for transferring oil to or from tank vessels.

The Act requires the Commission to write and update regulations for operations at marine terminals.

Operations manuals are required at all marine facilities and the division approves marine terminal ops manuals.

In addition, the Commission is directed to inspect facilities and monitor operations at oil terminals.

--000--

MARINE FACILITIES DIVISION ACTING CHIEF MERCIER:

This slide shows the geographical distribution of division undertakings.

Our northern California field office is located in Hercules and covers the State's northern half, roughly aligned with the sector San Francisco of the Coast Guard. The NCFO monitors 19 marine terminals.

The Division's four outstanding environmental scientists are located in the Sacramento office.

2.4

The Division headquarters and southern California field office are co-located in Long Beach. The headquarters includes our Engineering Branch, Planning Branch, and Marine Invasive Species Database staff.

The southern California field office oversees the operations of 32 onshore and offshore terminals from Goleta down to San Diego.

--000--

MARINE FACILITIES DIVISION ACTING CHIEF MERCIER:

This slide shows the breakout of our division organization by branch. We are primarily a field operations organization with a majority of the staff in the field offices.

The field office marine safety specialists not only monitor marine oil transfers, but they also inspect vessels for compliance with the State's Marine Invasive Species program.

The Planning and Human Factors Branch focus on reviewing regulations and researching improved methods for

mitigating risks and reducing causes of incidents.

2.4

Our engineers are the only State engineers with experience in construction of waterfront structures, including piers and wharfs. You'll hear more about them in the Environmental Branch in a few minutes.

--000--

MARINE FACILITIES DIVISION ACTING CHIEF MERCIER: So how are we doing?

These graphs track our performance over the last 11 years. There were over 6,000 transfers at California marine terminals in 2010. Our staff is in the field seven days a week and we monitor more than 2,500, or 40 percent, of the transfers.

In contrast, there were 11 small spills at terminals for the year.

So that's 6,200 transfers, 11 spills.

--000--

MARINE FACILITIES DIVISION ACTING CHIEF MERCIER:

These pictures show a little bit of what the staff finds when they go out in the field. Of the 2,500 boardings that we made, we had to do this 78 times at the offshore moorings. The hookups at the terminals are typically by hoses or loading arms.

--000--

MARINE FACILITIES DIVISION ACTING CHIEF MERCIER:

In 2010, more than 28 billion gallons of oil were transferred to California marine terminals. That's 77 million gallons a day. All last year there were only 63 gallons spilled. So that's 28 billion gallons, 63 gallons spilled.

In summary, we -- the Marine Facilities Division is the little known organization that you don't hear very much of because we represent the spills that you never hear of because they didn't happen. That's with the exception of the two people following me, which makes our division pretty popular throughout the world.

Next I'll introduce Mr. Martin Eskijian, our award winning chief engineer. Tomorrow Martin will be in La Jolla to receive the Charles Martin Duke Lifeline Earthquake Engineering Award from the American Society of Civil Engineers. The award is presented annually to those who make definite contribution to the advancement of lifeline earthquake engineering.

Martin, congratulations, and you're up.
(Applause.)

MR. ESKIJIAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and commissioners, and ladies and gentlemen. My name is Martin Eskijian, for the record.

I'm going to describe very quickly the marine oil terminal engineering and maintenance standards that came

about.

2 --000--

MR. ESKIJIAN: A little history. If you all remember the 1994 Northridge earthquake, following that earthquake FEMA said, "We'll give hazard mitigation grants to anybody that can write regulations to mitigate the effects of the next earthquake."

And in 1995, we were awarded money -- significant money then -- supplemented by the State Lands Commission to develop standards.

Why did we do this?

Well, first of all, the act that Kevin's referred to says that we, the Commission, are responsible for the performance standards of marine oil terminals. So with that as our vehicle, we felt we could move forward with regulations. And now we are Chapter 31F of the California Building Code between fire pits, radiation rooms, and swimming pools.

How did we get into this?

I started looking at these in the early nineties. And you can see a picture there on the left of the condition of these structures. It's what I call geriatric, and they're in serious or poor condition. If you read a textbook on marine structures, they tell you that 50 years is the life span of a marine structure, the

average age is over 55, probably closer to 60. There has been no upgrades. And you can imagine 60 years ago the standards for seismic loads are like nothing.

Vessels have grown in size significantly, from a couple hundred feet to a thousand feet. And you all know that sail areas get bigger with size. Impact loads get larger, just like you remember from high school physics, one-half MB<sup>2</sup>, M is much higher and velocity becomes critical, higher berthing loads, higher mooring loads. And there's never been mooring analyses performed on these structures. Nobody ever said you had to.

So picture 1 gives an example of a Port of Los Angeles structure.

Excuse me.

MR. ESKIJIAN: The middle figure shows you what happens when you accidentally overload a structure beyond its gravity load capability.

And the third picture is an incident that happened in the Carquinez Strait not too long ago, which illustrates that if you're on a tugboat and you're in the middle of the night and you see the wrong light and you're not -- you're asleep downstairs, what can happen.

And so don't even stop the tugboat where the pipelines are, and you say why am I showing that? I'm

showing it because following that incident, the organization that ran that facility knew exactly what they had to do to comply with MOTEMS: Rehabilitate and explain what they were doing and how they were going to do it. It was all figured out.

--000--

MR. ESKIJIAN: So we have now looked at 27 high and moderate risk terminals in what we call the audit, which includes what's listed there. And it's sort of like a 60-year-old man going to the doctor and getting his EKG and his colonoscopy, et cetera, et cetera - we won't go into that, but it's similar, except for a structure. And those are the items listed to give it a complete physical.

And we found that there are serious deficiencies. And they're documented in an example there shown in the middle which is on my desk. And an audit has like four to six volumes. So you can multiply that times 27 and get some idea the magnitude of what we're talking about.

We're the only state in the union that has such a law. We know that it's being used in other places around the world. And I believe it's the standard now in the country of Turkey, following a -- when we went there following a 1999 earthquake and tsunami.

The document also contains a clause on sea level rise, and is also part of the military -- U.S. military,

their guidelines, so they're supposed to be followed.

On the right, another terminal that had a little problem there with their deck.

--000--

MR. ESKIJIAN: In addition to looking at the audits, as we see rehabilitation occurring, we find we get volumes of analysis and design that have to be looked at by our engineering staff of seven engineers. And what I didn't realize 15 years ago was that I was creating a monster. And I know now that the monster keeps growing and needs to be fed. And the minute I think we've got it under control, the monster gets bigger.

New structures. We have one being considered right now for the Port of Los Angeles, a major crude oil terminal called Pier 400, Berth 408. Many of the terminals in the north and the south require major seismic rehabilitation, which is a significant big deal, costing millions of dollars, upgrading mooring and berthing dolphins, because they can't carry the loads of these modern vessels.

And also they've now found that there's geotechnical issues such as liquefaction, lateral spreading. And what we found too is that the soil moves underneath the piles and makes the piles no longer vertical but now are going to angle, which we observed in

Chile following the earthquake there.

So there's lots of things to do and lots more activities.

And that pretty much ends my discussion, unless you have any questions.

Yes.

ACTING COMMISSIONER KLASS: When was MOTEMS adopted?

MR. ESKIJIAN: It became law in 2006. And it was written so that 30 months after that - so there was a time gap before it became, quote, enforceable - was 30 months after that.

ACTING COMMISSIONER KLASS: In my previous capacity I remember, probably ten years ago or something on that order, State Lands came and made a presentation about the horrible deferred maintenance at many of our marine terminals.

I wonder in the past decade, can you give me a sense of, is the situation worse in that time frame or is it getting better or --

MR. ESKIJIAN: Gee, that's a very good question.

We find a lot of terminals, especially in the Carquinez Strait, where there's a refinery next to the oil terminal that they are cooperating, they're moving ahead. And it's significant amounts of funds to do it.

We are talking to the ports of L.A. and Long
Beach. And leasing and scheduling has become an issue.
There are some that look as bad as the one I showed you,
the timber structure. They're still there. And the ships
are getting bigger and the risk is getting bigger.

ACTING COMMISSIONER KLASS: Thank you.

MR. ESKIJIAN: Thank you.

2.4

At this time, I'd like to introduce the third facet of the marine -- yeah, go ahead, go ahead, Mr. Chiang.

COMMISSIONER CHIANG: I'm sorry.

Do we employ any clean or green standards to the building?

MR. ESKIJIAN: Pardon me?

COMMISSIONER CHIANG: Do you employ any clean or green standards to the building construction? We are the State Lands Commission.

MR. ESKIJIAN: No. Chapter 31F does not get into green issues except for, you know, the timber has to be of the right -- you can't use creosote and those kinds of things. But all the work that is done goes through environmental review, and some do require major environmental issues to be treated and processed.

COMMISSIONER CHIANG: I'd like to get -- I was thinking -- we don't have to have it here, but can we

think about building materials, reuse, all the principles, you know, climate change impacts of what we're doing.

Obviously, if we're -- we talk about sea level rise and we're concerned about climate change adaptation, but we ought to think about it in our --

MR. ESKIJIAN: Yes. Sea level rise is already included, and it is now required that the operator consider that. And there are documents out there, one by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, that give curves to tell you where that's going in this century. And it does affect marine oil terminals in terms of increased depth, which means a larger arrival mass. So there are issues, and we ask people to address it. It's in the code today.

COMMISSIONER CHIANG: And how about energy, energy use?

MR. ESKIJIAN: Energy use, we haven't -- we've seen what's called cold ironing on one of the terminals, where instead of having the engine on when they're pumping, it is using electricity from shore.

That's at Berth 121, Port of Long Beach. And that is now operational. It is a major -- it's a big deal to make the terminals go to that. But it has started.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: Commissioner Chiang, if I could add. Of all the programs that the Commission operates under, this is -- the Marine Facilities Division

is the only one that's really a regulatory branch of the Commission. Prior to that, we were strictly a land management agency.

There's a specific provision in the Public Resources Code that bars the Commission from setting building standards. So technically when the MOTEMS standards were adopted, we had to go through the State Building to get them adopted in the Building Code to actually make them enforceable.

So unless that statute's changed or we go through the State Building Code, we're pretty much barred from setting building standards by that existing code section.

MR. ESKIJIAN: Yeah. And we just went to the Building Standards Commission, and we have now -- the first revision is out. It's on our website. And that was effective 1 January 2011, but yet it cost me a year of my time because we had to go to the Building Standards Commission rather than through the State Lands Commission.

COMMISSIONER CHIANG: Yeah, I'd like us to think about it. I don't know how much openness they have to it, especially -- but if it's economically viable, we ought to be pushing this, especially since, you know, in every other aspect we're at the forefront.

MR. ESKIJIAN: Okay. Any other comments or questions?

Thank you very much.

I'm going to introduce now Ms. Maurya Falkner. She is the third facet of the Marine Facilities Division, in charge of invasive species, and she manages the program.

Ms. Falkner.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was Presented as follows.)

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM MANAGER I FALKNER: Thanks, Martin. And good afternoon, commissioners.

Some of us have been through this marine invasive species stuff for quite awhile. Cindy, I think you've been along for the ride for the whole time.

--000--

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM MANAGER I FALKNER: So I'm Maurya Falkner. I'm the Environmental Program Manager within the Marine Facilities Division. And as Martin said, I'll be talking about the third facet of the Marine Facilities Division, the Marine Invasive Species program.

Just for a little primer, nonindigenous species are also referred to frequently as exotics, invasives, aliens, or introduced organisms. They are organisms that are transported by human activities to regions outside their natural range. And while there are several mechanisms by which we transport them -- humans transport

organisms around within the coastal environments, commercial shipping is considered the most important.

And commercial shipping can transport organisms through two primary methods. One is ballast water and the other is biofouling.

Ballast water, which is being shown discharging here on this vessel, is necessary for many functions related to the trim, stability, and maneuverability of large seagoing vessels. Vessels have to take on ballast water -- or may take on ballast water, discharge it, or move it around, depending on cargo loading operations, fuel use, weather conditions when they're out at sea.

In general, vessels take on ballast water as they -- as cargo is unloaded in a port. And then they discharge that water into another port when cargo is loaded. So they transfer ballast water from a source port to a receiving port. And this transfer of ballast water results in the movement of many organisms from one region to another.

Vessel fouling, on the other hand, is when -- is shown in this picture here. Those are organisms attached to the wetted portions of a vessel. When a vessel moves from port to port, fouling communities are also transported. And these may be attached or they may be associated with -- or organisms can be associated with the

attached parts of the vessel. They release and spawn or they can be knocked off during various operations.

California Legislators were very concerned about the ongoing impact of these -- of invasive species on California's economy and ecology, and they passed legislation in 1999 to address this invasive threat.

Our mission within the Marine Facilities

Division, Marine Invasive Species program is to prevent
the introduction of nonindigenous species via commercial
shipping through these two vectors.

Vessels currently are required to manage their ballast water and conduct regular biofouling removal. The current ballast water management practices are either full retention of ballast water or exchange. However, by 2016, vessels will be required to meet a performance standard which is currently the strictest in the world.

--000--

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM MANAGER I FALKNER: The Marine Invasive Species program utilizes a multifaceted approach to run its program. We develop our policies based on technical advisory group meetings with technical experts and various stakeholders. We collect and track over 10,000 pieces of complex data annually. We identify and facilitate various research that's necessary to meet the mandate of the law. And we report back biannually to

you, the Commissioners, as well as to the Legislature on our activities.

In addition to the Marine Facilities Division, we partner with the Department of Fish and Game. They conduct biological surveys of the ports, bays, and open coastal areas in the state to determine any -- to identify any new invasive species and to assess the effectiveness of our program.

The Board of Equalization collects a fee and deposits that fee into the Marine Invasive Species Control Fund. The entire program within the state is special fund fees assessed on vessels.

And then the State Water Board operates with us in a consultative role.

--000--

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM MANAGER I FALKNER: As we continue to move forward, we have a lot of interesting things on our plate. For the next 12 to 18 months we're going to be required to -- we're continuing to implement performance standards for ballast water discharge. And we're in the process now of developing regulations that will help reduce the introductions through biofouling.

We have several collaborative and funded projects that we're working on, two of which are shown here. One is with Cal Maritime Academy, the U.S. Maritime

Administration, and the State Lands Commission are all funding a program to test treatment facilities on board a teaching vessel at Cal Maritime Academy in Vallejo.

We also work closely with Portland State and Smithsonian on biofouling issues and getting a better handle on what our data show, what the papers show versus what they're actually seeing when they dive.

Finally, we do quite a bit of work -- we have an active role in several organizations at the State, federal, and international levels. And because California has often been a leader in the marine invasive species control, we have been -- staff has been invited to speak or participate on several committees and panels, some of which are identified here - west coast -- Pacific Ballast Water Group. We meet on an annual basis to coordinate our programs and to work with the maritime industry.

At the federal level we work with the National Invasive Species Council.

And then at the international level we consult with Germany, the Netherlands, and Sweden on a North Sea Ballast Water Program that they are implementing.

As part of all these activities, Commission staff is going to continue to use the current resources to work proactively with the regulated industry; the scientific community; and the State, national, and international

regulatory agencies to continue to reduce the risk of biological invasions in California waters.

And thank you, and I'll be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Just curiosity. Portland State, did they have a particular discipline in the biofouling area, or do our state universities have any similar discipline in their partnerships with our CSUs?

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM MANAGER I FALKNER: We work actually with California State University, San Jose, to do quite a bit of the ballast water treatment technology work. So we have researchers out at Moss Landing that are doing work on that. It just happens that the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center was kind of the leader in the biofouling research and they happen to have a collaborative relationship with Portland State University.

But we utilize -- in addition to the academicians at that, we also have people here in the state at various levels that work with us on these biofouling issues. And in fact one of my staff is a certified scientific diver and he routinely goes and assists on these diving operations. So we have people in the state doing that. This was just a small example of the work we're doing.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Yeah. No, just curious. I mean sitting on that CSU Board, we're looking for

90

```
1
    partnerships and --
 2
             (Laughter.)
 3
             ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM MANAGER I FALKNER:
 4
    And we work quite a bit with UC Davis folks, with Wim
5
    Kimmerer out of the Bay Area, and then Moss Landing. And
6
    so we try to -- because we do have the expertise. But
7
    many of the -- so we try to keep a nice tight network with
8
    those folks.
9
             CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM:
                                  That's great.
10
             ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM MANAGER I FALKNER:
11
    you.
12
             CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM:
                                  Important work. Thank you.
13
             ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM MANAGER I FALKNER:
                                                        Thank
14
   you.
15
             EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: And thank you,
16
    Commissioners, for your patience. We only have two more
17
   presentations, and I believe they'll be fairly quick.
18
             You'll now hear from Cy Oggins. And Cy is the
    Chief of the Division of Environmental Planning and
19
20
    Management. Cy has been with the State for 20 years and
21
    previously worked in the Division before going to the
22
    Department of Conservation. Last year we were able to woo
    him back to the Commission.
23
2.4
             (Thereupon an overhead presentation was
25
             Presented as follows.)
```

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING DIVISION CHIEF OGGINS:

Good afternoon, Mr. Chair, members of the Commission.

2.4

The Division of Environmental Planning and Management was formed in 1975. Its stated purpose is to ensure the compliance of the Commission with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, or CEQA, and to provide analytical staff services to the members of the Commission, the Executive Officer, and the Commission's three line program, each of which you heard from.

--000--

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING DIVISION CHIEF OGGINS:

What isn't so clearly stated is that DEPM's goal is to take what some people view as a very confusing and disorganized environmental review process in California and turn it into a very organized process with extensive public comment and participation at multiple stages of the process that leads ultimately to an action by the Commission and hopefully to a document certified by the Commission that can then be used by other agencies in their permitting processes.

--000--

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING DIVISION CHIEF OGGINS:

Our staff is fairly small. We have ten staff -

nine environmental scientists and a divisional secretary.

Our staff is funded -- 60 percent of our staff is funded through reimbursements by our project applicants.

--000--

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING DIVISION CHIEF OGGINS:

Again, our primary role is to ensure compliance with CEQA. We do this by preparing environmental impact reports and other CEQA documents for projects on Commission-owned lands. We also review other agencies' CEQA documents for projects that may affect Commission lands.

--000--

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING DIVISION CHIEF OGGINS: We provide for extensive public and agency coordination including review and comment on the Commission documents, as I mentioned earlier. For approved projects, we ensure compliance with the measures -- mitigation measures approved by the Commission. And we have other responsibilities, including extensive interagency coordination and collaboration efforts throughout the state. And we house the agency's Geographic Information Systems program.

--000--

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING DIVISION CHIEF OGGINS: We prepare EIRs and other CEQA documents to support land

management lease applications; marine oil terminal leases, both new and renewals; onshore and offshore oil development leases; and other Commission approvals.

--000--

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING DIVISION CHIEF OGGINS: In the next two years we anticipate working with our Land Management Division closely on multiple renewable energy projects, including the Lucerne Valley Solar Project in San Bernardino County, Pacific Gas & Electric Wave Energy project offshore Santa Barbara County, the Truckhaven Geothermal Project in Imperial County, a Tule Wind project in San Diego County, sand mining projects in San Francisco Bay, a potential new ocean outfall offshore McKinleyville in Humboldt County, a new master plan for the Owens Lake bed, and a vessel management plan for Tomales Bay in Marin County.

--000--

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING DIVISION CHIEF OGGINS:

Again, in the next two years we will be working with our Land Management Division and Marine Facilities
Division on multiple marine oil terminal lease renewals,
including Shell Martinez, Shore and Tesoro Amarco and Avon
wharves in San Francisco Bay; the decommissioning of the
Chevron Estero Marine Terminal in San Luis Obispo County,
and monitoring of mitigation measures at Chevron's El

Segundo marine terminal in Los Angeles County that was approved last year, the Chevron Long Wharf in San Francisco Bay, and Venoco Ellwood in Santa Barbara County.

--000--

## ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING DIVISION CHIEF OGGINS:

And as Greg Scott mentioned earlier, we'll be working with our Mineral Resources Management Division on multiple oil development projects, including a project by Carone to drill from federal waters into State waters; the Montalvo Wells project which is onshore in Ventura County on the coastline; the recommissioning of Pier PRC 421 and a new project called the Paredon lease, both of which are offshore Santa Barbara County.

We also hope to finally resolve the final disposition of Chevron shell mounds offshore Santa Barbara county and to bring to you an update on the Commission's Offshore Geophysical Survey Permit Program.

--000--

## ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING DIVISION CHIEF OGGINS:

And as we mentioned earlier, we have multiple interagency efforts throughout the state that we'll be working on, including Public Trust land efforts by Eagle Lake in Lassen and Honey Lake in Lake County; multiple projects in San Francisco Bay, in Lake Tahoe, and Owens Lake in southern California. We recently completed a

project at Seal Cove, which is to replace a dilapidated staircase at the Fitzgerald Marine Reserve and to build a bike trail in San Mateo County.

And then we also participate in multiple statewide efforts including the Abandoned Mine Lands Forum, multiple working groups with the Ocean Protection Council, and a new statewide advisory committee on cooling water intake structures.

And that concludes my portion of the presentation.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: Thank you, Cy.

And now our last, but certainly not least, Dave Brown. He's the Chief of our Administrative Information Services Division. Dave came to the Commission 31 years ago from the Highway Patrol. Dave's the man behind the curtain working all the levers to keep the agency functioning.

(Laughter.)

EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: Dave deals with our budget, contracting, personnel, computers, records, and more.

David.

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CHIEF BROWN: Well, that concludes my presentation.

(Laughter.)

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was Presented as follows.)

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CHIEF BROWN: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners. My name is Dave Brown and I am the Chief of the Administrative and Information Services Division. And our division provides support to all of the Commission line programs, all of the people you've heard from so far.

Our mission is to provide Commission management and staff with the resources that they need to achieve their program goals and objectives. We do this by providing comprehensive fiscal, information technology, records management, and human resource services.

--000--

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CHIEF BROWN: Our fiscal section manages a budget of just 208 positions, for all of the wonderful things you've heard that we do, and \$30 million from a variety of funding sources.

We also manage a system of full cost recovery for processing applications for the use of lands under the Commission's jurisdictions. We will recover the full cost of preparing and presenting all of the applications presented to you today. We are budgeted to recover \$4 1/2 million in this manner of 250 applications per year.

We also bill the leases that we charge rents on.

And we have nearly a thousand paying leases accruing over \$15 million annually to the General Fund.

We collect the royalties from the extraction of resources from these lands, which could total over \$350 million this year alone. Most of this is deposited to the General Fund as well.

We manage five office locations statewide and provide all contracts, travel, purchasing, and telecommunication services.

--000--

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CHIEF BROWN: We also provide a full range of information technology support. We manage the network Email, provide database management, information security, disaster recovery, and other IT services to all staff at all locations.

--000--

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CHIEF BROWN: In human resources, we provide all of the personnel services including recruitment, classification and pay, equal employment opportunity, labor relations, privacy protection, training, and so on.

--000--

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CHIEF BROWN: As the Commission has been in existence since 1938, and is the successor to the Surveyor General and various land boards

and commissions, we manage a huge amount of historical records. We provide retention services, historical record restoration and preservation, central file management, mail and reproduction services. We're responsible for over 47 million paper records, 30 million of which are located in our offices.

This unit also provides you with the support for these meetings and maintains an archive of all meeting records.

On our website, we have a comprehensive record of Commission meetings back to 1965, with copies of all calendar items and meeting minutes. We're working on getting all the way back to 1938.

I would also like to take this opportunity to review our current budget.

--000--

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CHIEF BROWN: The Commission has four major funding sources to support the programs you've heard about here today: The General Fund, the Oil Spill Prevention and Administration Fund, the Marine Invasive Species Control Fund, and Reimbursements.

--000--

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CHIEF BROWN: These funds support 208 positions. These positions are restricted by the fund sources to perform the work only in those program

areas supported by that funding.

2

1

--000--

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

25

24

past 20 years the proportion of these positions has been altered dramatically. In 1990, the Commission had 242

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CHIEF BROWN: Over the

As a result of budget reductions, a policy of full cost recovery from Commission lease and permit applicants, and new Commission programs such as Oil Spill Prevention and Marine Invasive Species, the General Fund positions now comprise less than a third of that total.

General Fund positions and a few reimbursed positions.

--000--

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CHIEF BROWN: Today there are only 63 1/2 General Fund positions remaining. is this such a big deal?

We all know that the General Fund has been in crisis for several years. But from the Commission's perspective, and my graph right here, you can see that this goes back with the Commission over two decades.

The significance is that these are the revenue positions. These are the positions that perform the royalty accounting, revenue receipts, auditing, and oil field management. These are also the positions responsible for enforcement, trespass investigation, litigation, and ejectments.

These are the positions responsible for protecting the Public Trust. And over the past 20 years these program areas have been suffering a death by a thousand cuts. None that would be fatal, but cumulatively they're having a significant impact on the Commission's ability to carry out its core program objectives. And to maintain revenues and protect the Public Trust.

--000--

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CHIEF BROWN: In spite of these reductions, the Commission's staff has continued to ensure a significant flow of revenue. The Commission has collected more than \$9.2 billion since its inception in 1938. Over a billion of this has been deposited to the General Fund in the last three years alone. Commission revenues are the second largest source of non-tax revenues behind the State lottery, third depending on if you count Indian gaming.

A lot of this has been dependent on highly skilled and experienced staff with long tenure at the Commission, many of whom continue to work as annuitants after retirement.

However, as these staff are no longer available, the Commission will be in for some significant challenges.

Thank you for your attention. And I think after 30 years with the Commission, I seem to be the one long in

the tooth here. I'm excited about these programs, as you can tell. And again thank you.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Dave, just a quick question.

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CHIEF BROWN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: On those 47 million or so paper records and all these Commission minutes, et cetera, what do you do with it? I mean, it's one thing -- you know, I've kind of become a fanatic a bit about government as a platform in allowing people to take governmental information in an open way and be able to then mash it up in a machine-readable way and actually provide those records. And not the gotcha kind of government where it's the press always trying to go after you and say, "Hey, see, we gotcha" or some auditor, but to use this public information provided for by the public, paid for by the public, in a meaningful way and allow people to mash it out, these developers, as Apple allows applications to be developed on their platform.

Are we doing anything along those lines? Do we have machine readable, downloadable data from this Commission where people can utilize without having to pay great sums and resources?

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CHIEF BROWN: We have attempted to get started on that on several occasions. And every time we've gained a little bit of momentum,

another General Fund crisis has hit.

That little hump -- can we go back to the -- there was a --

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: The one where you had the 242 bounced up to 90 something, around to --

administrative Services Chief Brown: It bounced up a little bit. A lot of those positions there were during the Davis administration. And we received those partially to do exactly what you're talking about, to develop a system to copy some of these historic records. A lot of our records are so old that they're literally turning to dust. And in many cases, we've taken what we call our swamp and overflow records. We are just about ready to finish that up. That would be probably enough records to fill that area behind Cindy three times over.

We've digitized all of that. We're going to send those over to the State Archives. We're the first agency that has been able to negotiate an agreement with the Archives where we can put our stuff there and retain ownership, because we need it for litigation and so on.

But those other records we now have in digital format. And we could make them available given the resources to do so.

So, yes, that's in our long-term plans. And it's only people and money.

103

```
1
             (Laughter.)
             CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: Yeah, I guess --
 2
 3
             (Laughter.)
 4
             CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: All right. Well, further
   discussions down the road.
5
6
             Thank you.
7
             ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES CHIEF BROWN:
8
    Thank you.
9
             CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM:
                                  Thanks so much.
10
             EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOSSUM: That concludes the
11
    staff's presentations for today.
12
             CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: I'm grateful.
13
             Thank you, all of you. And it was particularly
14
    helpful to the new guy, which is me. So I'm very
15
    appreciative of your time.
16
             And thank you to my colleague for indulging, as
17
   he's been on this body for a lot longer than I, and a lot
    of that I'm sure is familiar, but nonetheless helpful.
18
    It's a refresher.
19
20
             So I think that concludes the regular calendar.
             And this is the opportunity for anyone who hasn't
21
   had a chance to share their voice to share their voice in
22
23
   public comment on anything that is on your mind related to
2.4
    business in front of us.
```

And clearly there is nothing either on your mind

25

or there are no members of the public here, one or the other.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON NEWSOM: So we'll close public

comment.

And this I think formally now concludes the open portion of our meeting. And now it is time for us to go into closed session.

So thank you all very much for being here. And we'll try to clear the room. And as we do that, we'll organize for a quick closed session.

Thank you.

(Thereupon the California State Lands Commission meeting adjourned at 3:32 p.m.)

## 1 <u>CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER</u>

I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand
Reporter of the State of California, and Registered
Professional Reporter, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing California State Lands Commission meeting was reported in shorthand by me, James F. Peters, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California;

That the said proceedings was taken before me, in shorthand writing, and was thereafter transcribed, under my direction, by computer-assisted transcription.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of said hearing.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 14th day of February, 2011.

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR, RPR
Certified Shorthand Reporter
License No. 10063